

Rome, July 31, 2014

To the Editor of WJG

Dear Prof,

thank you again for the comments to the manuscript entitled: Colon Capsule endoscopy: what we know and what we would like to know, by C. Spada et al.

We have added to the authors: G. Andrisani and M. Campanale. In the revised version, changes are highlighted.

Enclosed here you will find the revised version of the paper, according to new referees' comments.

In particular, we addressed the comments as follows:

**Reviewer #1:**

**INTRODUCTION** – In the last sentence of the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, authors write that caecal intubation failure rate can reach the 20% of colonoscopies in clinical practice. The reference quoted includes colonoscopies done over 30 yrs ago and not true in today's practice. Consider omitting that statement.

**Authors:** corrected.

**INTRODUCTION** – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. The authors give ref. 9-23 for just two prior statements. Consider revising and putting references appropriately

**Authors:** corrected.

**WHAT WE KNOW** - There are no references quoted after the first two sentences. Consider giving references for the remaining paragraph.

**Authors:** corrected

**BOWEL PREPARATION** – last sentence of this section says that results of different regimens of preparation are shown in table 2 – but no there is no information about the preparation regimen in table 2.

**Authors:** corrected

**ACCURACY AND CLINICAL INDICATIONS** – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, last sentence. Authors write that “CCE was demonstrated to have a significant higher diagnostic yield for significant polyps (i.e. polyps  $\geq$  6 mm) when compared to CT-colonography” and quote ref no 31. However, this study showed that both CCE and CT colonography detect polyps 6mm and larger with high level of accuracy but CCE is better tolerated. It does NOT say that CCE has significantly higher diagnostic yield when compared to CT colonography.

**Authors:** corrected

Tables should have appropriate headings. Also, the studies quoted in the tables should have reference number quoted next to them. Some of the studies mentioned in the tables are not mentioned in the references.

**Authors:** corrected

#### **MINOR SUGGESTIONS:**

**ACCURACY AND CLINICAL INDICATIONS** – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph line 4 should read as: The relative low number of “patient” studies and not “patients” studies. The same sentence continued should read as – is a clear “limitation” and not “limitations”.

**Authors:** corrected

**ACCURACY AND CLINICAL INDICATIONS** – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph line 9 should read as - only a minority of false positives “were” related to and not “where” related to.

**Authors:** corrected

**Reference 2** – should be Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic ‘polypectomy’ and not ‘polipectomy’

**Authors:** corrected

The review would have a higher impact if the authors could comment on the following topics:

- a. CCE for serrated lesions : **Authors:** added
- b. Rate of interval cancer after negative CCE: **Authors:** added

c. Role of CCE specifically in detecting right sided polyps: **Authors:** added

**Reviewer #2:**

**Abstract:** Reappraise the possible risk of major complications, and mortality related to the colonoscopy.

**Authors:** added

**WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW:** Discuss in detail the possible application of CCE in IBD patients (1. e. to guide therapeutic change during flare-up, in the follow-up) and in pediatric population.

**Authors:** added

**Reviewer #3:**

Very well written and interesting review article that clarifies the current and future role of CCE Few minor remarks:

-A table considering current indications and contraindication should be added :

**Authors:** added

-A picture of the CCE capsule, system and colon image should be added : **Authors:** added

The first sentence in the conclusions is wrongly written- please change : **Authors:** corrected

There are no headings in the tables- please add: **Authors:** corrected

Cristiano Spada, MD

